



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,223	08/04/2003	Chris Tengwall	122043/167301	6507
51414 7590 04/07/2008 GOODWIN PROCTER LLP PATENT ADMINISTRATOR EXCHANGE PLACE BOSTON, MA 02109-2881				
EXAMINER SHERKAT, AREZOO				
ART UNIT 2131		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 04/07/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/634,223

Applicant(s)

TENGWALL ET AL.

Examiner

AREZOO SHERKAT

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-80 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-80 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

This office action is responsive to Applicant's amendment received on 1/11/2008. Claims 24, 26, and 71 are amended. Claims 1-80 remain pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/11/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that "in Applicants' system, the Relay Arrangement is associated with the *recipient* wireless device as opposed to Forman where the determination is made on the *sender* side by the composer of the email" (Remarks, page 15).

Examiner respectfully disagrees and would like to point out that Forman explicitly discloses that the status notification module 62 of the server system 11 receives the request from the status check module 32 of the sender application; it then accesses the status table 61 of the server system 11 for the status information of that email address. The status notification module 62 then sends the status information to the sender application such that the status of the recipient application is determined before a message is sent to the recipient application (par. 55). Note that the determination step that decides whether or not the message is sent to the recipient is done by the status notification module 62 of the server system by consulting the status table 61. Therefore, to the extent of the claim language currently presented Forman

Art Unit: 2131

does disclose wherein the data is "only transmitted when the at least one relay arrangement determines that the at least one wireless device can receive the data ...".

Drawings

The drawings were received on 1/11/2008. These drawings are *acceptable*.

Claim Objections

Regarding claim 71, the claim objection is withdrawn due to amendment received on 1/11/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Regarding claim 71, the 35 USC § 112, 2d paragraph, is withdrawn due to amendment received on 1/11/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 9-18, and 22-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Little et al., (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0205248 and Little hereinafter), in view of Forman, (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0120733).

Regarding claims 1 and 55, Little discloses a system for transmitting data stored in at least one database and processed by a server arrangement to at least one wireless device (i.e., mobile device 816 and 818) that receives data from a wireless carrier network (i.e., wireless networks 812 and 814), the system comprising:

at least one relay arrangement (i.e., wireless connector system 828) for routing the data to the wireless carrier network (i.e., wireless networks 812 and 814) for transmission over the wireless carrier network to at least one wireless device (i.e., mobile device 816 and 818), and a firewall arrangement (i.e., firewall 808) that provides security for the data, the server arrangement (i.e., message server 820) and each relay arrangement (page 7, par. 64), wherein each relay arrangement (i.e., wireless connector system 828) is arranged behind the firewall arrangement and is configured to push the data from behind the firewall arrangement to the at least one wireless device (page 7-8, par. 67 and page 9, par. 76-82 – wherein the wireless connector system 828 and the message server 820, both clearly protected within the firewall, are designed to cooperate and interact to allow pushing of the information to mobile devices 816, 818).

Little does not explicitly disclose that the data is only transmitted when the at least one relay arrangement determines that the at least one wireless device can receive the data.

However, Forman discloses an email server system that manages the status of every email address registered in and managed by the email server system before sending a message to the recipient (i.e., to make sure the recipient email address has a normal/in-office or valid status as opposed to out-of-office or invalid)(par. 31, 36, and 54-55). Forman explicitly discloses that the status notification module 62 of the server system 11 receives the request; it accesses the status table 61 for the status information of that email address. The status notification module 62 then sends the status information to the sender application such that the status of the recipient application is determined before a message is sent to the recipient application (par. 55). Note that the determination step that decides whether or not the message is sent to the recipient is done by the status notification module 62 of the server system by consulting the status table 61.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Little with teachings of Forman because it would allow determining the status of the recipient application before a message is sent to the recipient application as disclosed by Forman. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Forman to allow users of the email system to save time and effort by checking the status of the recipient email address before sending an email (Forman, par.13-14).

Regarding claim 10, Little discloses a method for transmitting data, comprising:

retrieving data via a server arrangement (i.e., message server 820), processing the data in the server arrangement, sending the data to a relay arrangement arranged behind a firewall arrangement and processing the data in the relay arrangement (i.e. wireless connector system 828), and routing the data to the at least one wireless carrier network for transmission to at least one wireless device, the data being pushed from the relay arrangement from behind the firewall arrangement to the at least one wireless device, the firewall arrangement providing security for the data, the server arrangement and the relay arrangement (page 7-8, par. 67 – wherein the wireless connector system 828 and the message server 820, both clearly protected within the firewall, are designed to cooperate and interact to allow pushing of the information to mobile devices 816, 818).

receiving the data at the at least one wireless carrier network (i.e., any of the wireless networks 812 and 814), processing the data in the at least one wireless carrier network, sending the data to the at least one wireless device, receiving the data at the at least one wireless device, and processing the data in the at least one wireless device (page 8, par. 72), whereby the data is not persistently stored outside the firewall arrangement until reception by the wireless device (page 8, par. 72-73 and page 9, par. 76-82 - As disclosed in par. 73 of Little's disclosure and in light of interview on 10/25/2007, when the VPN router 832 is not available, i.e., when the push-technique is applied through path 834, the addressing of the mobile device is

handled by the wireless infrastructure 810, which is clearly not within the firewall. However, nowhere in the Little it has been disclosed that the data/message is persistently stored outside the firewall before reception by the wireless device. The Fact that the wireless infrastructure 810 locates a given user and tracks users as they roam between networks, at best implies that *it persistently stores routing/addressing information of the users/devices of different wireless networks required for sending each message to the right recipient wireless device*. But it doesn't imply that the data/message, which is to be sent to the wireless device, is persistently stored on the wireless infrastructure 810 outside the firewall arrangement before reception by the wireless device).

Little does not explicitly disclose that the data is only transmitted when the at least one relay arrangement determines that the at least one wireless device can receive the data.

However, Forman discloses an email server system that manages, checks, and verifies the status of every email address registered in and managed by the email server system before sending a message to the recipient (i.e., to make sure the recipient email address has a normal/in-office or valid status as opposed to out-of-office or invalid)(par. 31, 36, and 54-55). Forman explicitly discloses that the status notification module 62 of the server system 11 receives the request; it accesses the status table 61 for the status information of that email address. The status notification module 62 then sends the status information to the sender application such that the status of the recipient application is determined before a

message is sent to the recipient application (par. 55). Note that the determination step that decides whether or not the message is sent to the recipient is done by the status notification module 62 of the server system by consulting the status table 61.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Little with teachings of Forman because it would allow determining the status of the recipient application before a message is sent to the recipient application as disclosed by Forman. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Forman to allow users of the email system to save time and effort by checking the status of the recipient email address before sending an email (Forman, par.13-14).

Regarding claim 14, Little discloses an apparatus for transmitting data, comprising:

means for processing data, means for pushing the data directly to a wireless carrier network, means for securing the data, the means for processing and the means for pushing, and at least one wireless device that receives data from over the wireless carrier network, wherein the means for pushing is arranged behind the means for securing (i.e., firewall 808), and wherein the means for pushing is configured to push the data to at least one wireless device (page 7-8, par. 67 and page 9, par. 76-82 – wherein the wireless connector system 828 and the message server 820, both clearly protected within the firewall, are designed to cooperate and

interact to allow pushing of the information to mobile devices 816, 818), whereby the data is not persistently stored outside the firewall arrangement until reception by the wireless device (page 8, par. 72-73 and page 9, par. 76-82 - when the VPN router 832 is not available, i.e., when the push-technique is applied through path 834, the addressing of the mobile device is handled by the wireless infrastructure 810, which is clearly not within the firewall. However, nowhere in the Little it has been disclosed that the data/message is persistently stored outside the firewall before reception by the wireless device. The Fact that the wireless infrastructure 810 locates a given user and tracks users as they roam between networks, at best implies that *it persistently stores routing/addressing information of the users/devices of different wireless networks required for sending each message to the right recipient wireless device*. But it doesn't imply that the data/message, which is to be sent to the wireless device, is persistently stored on the wireless infrastructure 810 outside the firewall arrangement before reception by the wireless device).

Little does not explicitly disclose that the data is only transmitted when the at least one wireless device can receive the data.

However, Forman discloses an email server system that manages, checks, and verifies the status of every email address registered in and managed by the email server system before sending a message to the recipient (i.e., to make sure the recipient email address has a normal/in-office or valid status as opposed to out-of-office or invalid)(par. 31, 36, and 54-55). Forman explicitly discloses that the status notification module 62 of the server system 11 receives the request; it

accesses the status table 61 for the status information of that email address. The status notification module 62 then sends the status information to the sender application such that the status of the recipient application is determined before a message is sent to the recipient application (par. 55). Note that the determination step that decides whether or not the message is sent to the recipient is done by the status notification module 62 of the server system by consulting the status table 61.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Little with teachings of Forman because it would allow determining the status of the recipient application before a message is sent to the recipient application as disclosed by Forman. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Forman to allow users of the email system to save time and effort by checking the status of the recipient email address before sending an email (Forman, par.13-14).

Regarding claim 15, Little discloses a system for transmitting data stored in at least one database and processed by a server arrangement to at least one wireless device that receives data from a wireless carrier network, comprising:

at least one relay arrangement for routing the data to the wireless carrier network for transmission to the at least one wireless device, each relay arrangement being arranged within a controlled network and being configured to push the data from behind a firewall arrangement within the controlled network to the at least one

handheld wireless device (page 7-8, par. 67 and page 9, par. 76-82 – wherein the wireless connector system 828 and the message server 820, both clearly protected within the firewall, are designed to cooperate and interact to allow pushing of the information to mobile devices 816, 818), whereby the data is not persistently stored outside the firewall arrangement until reception by the wireless device (page 8, par. 72-73 and page 9, par. 76-82 - when the VPN router 832 is not available, i.e., when the push-technique is applied through path 834, the addressing of the mobile device is handled by the wireless infrastructure 810, which is clearly not within the firewall. However, nowhere in the Little it has been disclosed that the data/message is persistently stored outside the firewall before reception by the wireless device. The Fact that the wireless infrastructure 810 locates a given user and tracks users as they roam between networks, at best implies that *it persistently stores routing/addressing information of the users/devices of different wireless networks required for sending each message to the right recipient wireless device*. But it doesn't imply that the data/message, which is to be sent to the wireless device, is persistently stored on the wireless infrastructure 810 outside the firewall arrangement before reception by the wireless device).

Little does not explicitly disclose that the data is only transmitted when the at least one wireless device can receive the data.

However, Forman discloses an email server system that manages, checks, and verifies the status of every email address registered in and managed by the email server system before sending a message to the recipient (i.e., to make sure

the recipient email address has a normal/in-office or valid status as opposed to out-of-office or invalid)(par. 31, 36, and 54-55). Forman explicitly discloses that the status notification module 62 of the server system 11 receives the request; it accesses the status table 61 for the status information of that email address. The status notification module 62 then sends the status information to the sender application such that the status of the recipient application is determined before a message is sent to the recipient application (par. 55). Note that the determination step that decides whether or not the message is sent to the recipient is done by the status notification module 62 of the server system by consulting the status table 61.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Little with teachings of Forman because it would allow determining the status of the recipient application before a message is sent to the recipient application as disclosed by Forman. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Forman to allow users of the email system to save time and effort by checking the status of the recipient email address before sending an email (Forman, par.13-14).

Regarding claim 24, Little discloses an apparatus to route data for transmission over a wireless carrier network, comprising:

a first arrangement to relay data stored in at least one database and processed by a server arrangement directly to a wireless carrier network for

transmission to at least one wireless device, the first arrangement configured to be arranged behind a firewall arrangement that provides security for the data (pages 7-8, par. 65-68), the server arrangement and the first arrangement wherein the first arrangement is configured to push the data from behind the firewall arrangement to the at least one wireless device such that the data is not persistently stored outside the firewall arrangement until reception by the wireless device (page 8, par. 72-73 and page 9, par. 76-82 - when the VPN router 832 is not available, i.e., when the push-technique is applied through path 834, the addressing of the mobile device is handled by the wireless infrastructure 810, which is clearly not within the firewall. However, nowhere in the Little it has been disclosed that the data/message is persistently stored outside the firewall before reception by the wireless device. The Fact that the wireless infrastructure 810 locates a given user and tracks users as they roam between networks, at best implies that *it persistently stores routing/addressing information of the users/devices of different wireless networks required for sending each message to the right recipient wireless device*. But it doesn't imply that the data/message, which is to be sent to the wireless device, is persistently stored on the wireless infrastructure 810 outside the firewall arrangement before reception by the wireless device).

Little does not explicitly disclose that the data is only transmitted when the first arrangement to relay data determines that at least one wireless device can receive the data.

However, Forman discloses an email server system that manages, checks, and verifies the status of every email address registered in and managed by the email server system before sending a message to the recipient (i.e., to make sure the recipient email address has a normal/in-office or valid status as opposed to out-of-office or invalid)(par. 31, 36, and 54-55). Forman explicitly discloses that the status notification module 62 of the server system 11 receives the request; it accesses the status table 61 for the status information of that email address. The status notification module 62 then sends the status information to the sender application such that the status of the recipient application is determined before a message is sent to the recipient application (par. 55). Note that the determination step that decides whether or not the message is sent to the recipient is done by the status notification module 62 of the server system by consulting the status table 61.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Little with teachings of Forman because it would allow determining the status of the recipient application before a message is sent to the recipient application as disclosed by Forman. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Forman to allow users of the email system to save time and effort by checking the status of the recipient email address before sending an email (Forman, par.13-14).

Regarding claim 26, Little discloses a system for transmitting data stored in at least one database to at least one wireless device, comprising:

a relay arrangement to route the data directly to a wireless carrier network for transmission over the wireless carrier network, the relay arrangement configured to communicate with the at least one wireless device via a firewall arrangement that provides security for the data and the relay arrangement (pages 7-8, par. 65-68), wherein the relay arrangement is configured to push the data from behind the firewall arrangement to the at least one wireless such that the data is not persistently stored outside the firewall arrangement until reception by the wireless device (page 8, par. 72-73 and page 9, par. 76-82 - when the VPN router 832 is not available, i.e., when the push-technique is applied through path 834, the addressing of the mobile device is handled by the wireless infrastructure 810, which is clearly not within the firewall. However, nowhere in the Little it has been disclosed that the data/message is persistently stored outside the firewall before reception by the wireless device. The Fact that the wireless infrastructure 810 locates a given user and tracks users as they roam between networks, at best implies that *it persistently stores routing/addressing information of the users/devices of different wireless networks required for sending each message to the right recipient wireless device*. But it doesn't imply that the data/message, which is to be sent to the wireless device, is persistently stored on the wireless infrastructure 810 outside the firewall arrangement before reception by the wireless device).

Little does not explicitly disclose that the data is only transmitted when the first arrangement to relay data determines that at least one wireless device can receive the data.

However, Forman discloses an email server system that manages, checks, and verifies the status of every email address registered in and managed by the email server system before sending a message to the recipient (i.e., to make sure the recipient email address has a normal/in-office or valid status as opposed to out-of-office or invalid)(par. 31, 36, and 54-55). Forman explicitly discloses that the status notification module 62 of the server system 11 receives the request; it accesses the status table 61 for the status information of that email address. The status notification module 62 then sends the status information to the sender application such that the status of the recipient application is determined before a message is sent to the recipient application (par. 55). Note that the determination step that decides whether or not the message is sent to the recipient is done by the status notification module 62 of the server system by consulting the status table 61.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Little with teachings of Forman because it would allow determining the status of the recipient application before a message is sent to the recipient application as disclosed by Forman. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Forman to allow users of the email

system to save time and effort by checking the status of the recipient email address before sending an email (Forman, par.13-14).

Regarding claim 71, Little discloses an apparatus for transmitting data, comprising:

an arrangement for relaying data to a wireless carrier network (page 7-8, par. 67 and page 9, par. 76-82 – wherein the wireless connector system 828 and the message server 820, both clearly protected within the firewall, are designed to cooperate and interact to allow pushing of the information to mobile devices 816, 818), whereby the data is not persistently stored outside the firewall arrangement until reception by the wireless device (page 8, par. 72-73 and page 9, par. 76-82 - when the VPN router 832 is not available, i.e., when the push-technique is applied through path 834, the addressing of the mobile device is handled by the wireless infrastructure 810, which is clearly not within the firewall. However, nowhere in the Little it has been disclosed that the data/message is persistently stored outside the firewall before reception by the wireless device. The Fact that the wireless infrastructure 810 locates a given user and tracks users as they roam between networks, at best implies that *it persistently stores routing/addressing information of the users/devices of different wireless networks required for sending each message to the right recipient wireless device*. But it doesn't imply that the data/message, which is to be sent to the wireless device, is persistently stored on the wireless

infrastructure 810 outside the firewall arrangement before reception by the wireless device).

Little does not explicitly disclose that the data is only pushed beyond the arrangement to secure the data when the arrangement determines that at least one wireless device that receives data from over the wireless carrier network can receive the data.

However, Forman discloses an email server that manages, checks, and verifies the status of every email address registered in and managed by the email server system before sending a message to the recipient (i.e., to make sure the recipient email address has a normal/in-office or valid status as opposed to out-of-office or invalid)(par. 31, 36, and 54-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Little with teachings of Forman because it would allow determining the status of the recipient application before a message is sent to the recipient application as disclosed by Forman. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Forman to allow users of the email system to save time and effort by checking the status of the recipient email address before sending an email (Forman, par.13-14).

Regarding claims 2, 11, and 33, Little discloses wherein the data includes at least one of e-mail data and PIM data (page 7, par. 65).

Regarding claims 3, 9, and 13, Little discloses wherein the at least one wireless device receives encryption data wirelessly (pages 8, par. 72).

Regarding claim 4, Little discloses wherein the database includes at least one of an e-mail server (i.e., message server 820) and a database server (i.e., one or more data stores 817)(page 7, par. 66).

Regarding claim 12, Little discloses the method of claim 10, further comprising:

sending encryption data (i.e., through message repackaging technique) to the wireless device via a wireless connection, thus updating operational capabilities of the wireless device (i.e., bulk information updates)(page 3, par. 30-31).

Regarding claim 16, Little discloses wherein the firewall arrangement includes an enterprise firewall arrangement (page 7, par. 65).

Regarding claim 17, Little discloses wherein the at least one relay arrangement is configured to route the data via a private connection (page 8, par. 74).

Regarding claim 18, Little discloses wherein the at least one relay arrangement is configured to route the data via a frame relay connection (page 8, par. 74).

Regarding claims 22 and 30, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement includes at least two parts, at least one of which shares a common hardware platform with the server arrangement (page 7, par. 67).

Regarding claims 23, and 28-29, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement is configured to route the data over the wireless carrier network (page 7, par. 67).

Regarding claims 25, 27, and 31, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement is configured to push the data to the at least one wireless device (page 7-8, par. 67 and page 9, par. 76-82 – wherein the wireless connector system 828 and the message server 820, both clearly protected within the firewall, are designed to cooperate and interact to allow pushing of the information to mobile devices 816, 818).

Little does not explicitly disclose wherein the first arrangement is configured to transmit the data to a particular one of the at least one wireless device only when the particular wireless device is available to receive the data.

However, Forman discloses an email server that manages, checks, and verifies the status of every email address registered in and managed by the email server system before sending a message to the recipient (i.e., to make sure the recipient email address has a normal/in-office or valid status as opposed to out-of-office or invalid)(par. 31, 36, and 54-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Little with teachings of Forman because it would allow determining the status of the recipient application before a message is sent to the recipient application as disclosed by Forman. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Forman to allow users of the email system to save time and effort by checking the status of the recipient email address before sending an email (Forman, par.13-14).

Regarding claim 32, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement is configured to store the data if the at least one wireless device is not available to receive the data (page 7, par. 67).

Regarding claim 33, Little discloses the system of claim 1 wherein the data includes e-mail data (page 2, par. 24).

Regarding claims 34-35, Little discloses the system of claim 34, wherein the transport layer services include end-to-end acknowledgement of the transmission of the data to the at least one handheld wireless device (page 10, par. 88).

Regarding claim 36, Little discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the relay arrangement is configured to be under exclusive control of a single enterprise (page 7, par. 61 and 63).

Regarding claim 37, Little discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the relay arrangement is configured to be a non-shared resource with respect to other enterprises (page 7, par. 61 and 63).

Regarding claim 39, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement (i.e., wireless connector system 828) is configured to communicate with the wireless carrier network (page 7-8, par. 67).

Regarding claim 40, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement is configured to convert the data according to a data packet protocol associated with the wireless carrier network (i.e., frame relay or T1 connection using TCP/IP protocol)(page 2, par. 27 and page 8, par. 74-75).

Regarding claims 41 and 60, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement is configured to provide the data to plurality of device types over a plurality of wireless carrier network types (page 2, par. 27-28).

Regarding claim 42, Little discloses the system of claim 41, wherein at least two of the plurality of wireless carrier network types operate according to different transmission protocols (page 2, par. 27).

Regarding claims 38, 43-48, and 56, Little discloses wherein the data is routing directly to the wireless carrier network via the Internet (i.e., frame relay or T1 connection using TCP/IP protocol)(page 2, par. 22-25).

Regarding claims 49-54, Little discloses wherein the wireless carrier network is a public carrier network (page 7, par. 67).

Regarding claims 57-59, Little discloses wherein the data is routed directly to the wireless network via a dedicated connection (i.e., frame relay or T1 connection using TCP/IP protocol)(page 2, par. 22-25).

Regarding claim 61, Little discloses the system of claim 55, wherein the relay arrangement encodes the data, and pushes the data from behind the firewall arrangement to the at least one wireless device such that the data is not stored

outside of the firewall arrangement while enroute to the wireless network (page 9, par. 80-82).

Regarding claim 62, Little discloses the system of claim 55, wherein the relay arrangement is configured to push the data such that intermediate processing of the data does not occur enroute to the wireless network (page 9, par. 80-82).

Regarding claim 63, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement is configured to push the data to the at least one wireless device (page 7-8, par. 67 and page 9, par. 76-82 – wherein the wireless connector system 828 and the message server 820, both clearly protected within the firewall, are designed to cooperate and interact to allow pushing of the information to mobile devices 816, 818).

Little does not explicitly disclose that the data is not transmitted until a connection is established between the relay arrangement and the at least one wireless device, and the at least one wireless device can receive the data.

However, Forman discloses an email server system that manages, checks, and verifies the status of every email address registered in and managed by the email server system before sending a message to the recipient (i.e., to make sure the recipient email address has a normal/in-office or valid status as opposed to out-of-office or invalid)(par. 31, 36, and 54-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Little with teachings of Forman because it would allow determining the status of the recipient application before a message is sent to the recipient application as disclosed by Forman. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Forman to allow users of the email system to save time and effort by checking the status of the recipient email address before sending an email (Forman, par.13-14).

Regarding claim 64, Little does not explicitly disclose that the data is not transmitted until the at least one wireless device is "on", is within a service coverage area, and is logged onto the at least one wireless network.

However, Forman discloses an email server system that manages, checks, and verifies the status of every email address registered in and managed by the email server system before sending a message to the recipient (i.e., to make sure the recipient email address has a normal/in-office or valid status as opposed to out-of-office or invalid)(par. 31, 36, and 54-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Little with teachings of Forman because it would allow determining the status of the recipient application before a message is sent to the recipient application as disclosed by Forman. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated by the suggestion of Forman to allow users of the email system to save time and effort by checking the status of the recipient email address before sending an email (Forman, par.13-14).

Regarding claim 65, Little discloses the system of claim 63, wherein the connection is a synchronous connection (i.e., ISDN)(page 2, par. 27).

Regarding claim 66, Little discloses the system of claim 63, wherein the connection is a secure connection (page 4, par. 39-41).

Regarding claim 67, Little discloses the system of claim 63, wherein the connection is established using a data packet protocol (page 2, par. 27).

Regarding claim 68, Little discloses the system of claim 63, wherein the connection is established using an Internet protocol (page 2, par. 27).

Regarding claim 69, Little discloses the system of claim 55, wherein the data includes enterprise data (i.e., calendars, to-do lists, (enterprise) task list, email, and documentation)(page 2, par. 24).

Regarding claim 70, Little discloses the system of claim 55, wherein the relay arrangement is co-located on the same physical device (page 7, par. 64).

Regarding claims 72-75, Little discloses the method of claim 10, further comprising:

encoding the data prior to routing the data to the at least one wireless carrier network (page 9, par. 80-82).

Regarding claims 76-80, Little discloses wherein the at least one wireless device includes a handheld wireless device (page 2, par. 22 and page 3, par. 32).

Claims 5-8 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Little et al., (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0205248 and Little hereinafter), in view of Bommareddy et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,779,039 and Bommareddy hereinafter).

Teachings of Little with respect to limitation of claims 1, 10, and 14 have been discussed previously.

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Little does not expressly disclose a redundant server arrangement for the server arrangement.

However, Bommareddy discloses a redundant server arrangement for the server arrangement (col. 2, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the certificate management method and system of Little by including a redundant server arrangement for the server arrangement as disclosed by Bommareddy. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Bommareddy to improve both reliability and scalability of operations in comparison to single server operation (Bommareddy, col. 2, lines 1-10).

Regarding claims 7 and 8, Little does not expressly disclose a redundant relay arrangement for the relay arrangement.

However, Bommareddy discloses a redundant relay arrangement for the relay arrangement (i.e., clustering units wherein such redundancy may be implemented in the same or different geographic location as a design choice)(col. 5, lines 33-67 and col. 6, lines 1-30 and col. 7, lines 26-39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the certificate management method and system of Little by including a redundant relay arrangement for the relay arrangement as disclosed by Bommareddy. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Bommareddy to avoid difficulties that arise with a single point of failure (Bommareddy, col. 2, lines 57-65).

Regarding claims 19-21, Little does not expressly disclose further comprising: monitoring the at least one relay arrangement including the routing of the data from the relay arrangement.

However, Bommareddy discloses further comprising: monitoring the relay arrangement including the routing of the data from the relay arrangement (col. 6, lines 30-67 and col. 7, lines 1-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the certificate management method and system of Little by including monitoring the relay arrangement including the routing of the data from the relay arrangement as disclosed by Bommareddy. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Bommareddy to improve both reliability and scalability of operations in comparison to single server operation (Bommareddy, col. 2, lines 1-10).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AREZOO SHERKAT whose telephone number is (571)272-3796. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Arezoo Sherkat/

Patent Examiner

Group 2131

March 31, 2008

/Ayaz R. Sheikh/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2131